

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Application Number	10/691,383			
Filing Date	October 21, 2003			
First Named Inventor	Vreeland,, Valerie			
Art Unit	1652			
Examiner Name	Walicka, Malgorzata A.			
Attorney Docket Number 02307O-087130US				

Total Number of	Pages in This Submission	5	Attorney bocket Number	02307O-087	130US			
ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)								
Amendme Af Af Extension Express A Informatio Certified C Document Response Incomplete	iter Final fidavits/declaration(s) of Time Request bandonment Request n Disclosure Statement copy of Priority	Rem	Drawing(s) Licensing-related Papers Petition Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Addre Terminal Disclaimer Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s)	SS Africa April Ap	Technolo ppeal Con Appeals a ppeal Con ppeal Noti roprietary tatus Lette ther Encle entify bele to Restr pstcard	osure(s) (please ow): riction Requirement (3pp);		
			OF APPLICANT, ATTORNE	Y, OR AGEN	T			
Firm or	Townsend and Towns	send ar						
Individual name	Chuan Gao	Reg. No. 54,111						
Signature	Cenc							
Date August 9, 2004								
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING								
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below. Typed or printed name Stephania J. Whitehurst								
Signature		the state of the s	William S		Date	August 9, 2004		

IFW

certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United so Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Attorney Docket No.: 02307O-087130US Client Ref. No.: 2000-468-2

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On August 9, 2004

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND

By: Stephanie J. Whitehurst

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

VREELAND, Valerie

Application No.: 10/691,383

Filed: October 21, 2003

For: RECOMBINANT MINIMAL CATALYTIC VANADIUM HALOPEROXIDASES AND THEIR

USES

Customer No.: 20350

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 Confirmation No. 8387

Examiner:

WALICKA, Malgorzata A.

Technology Center/Art Unit: 1652

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION

REQUIREMENT

Sir:

In response to the Office communication mailed July 8, 2004, Applicants elect Group II, claims 14-24, drawn to a vanadium haloperoxidase polypeptide, for further prosecution. This election is made with traverse.

Appl. No. 10/691,383 Resp. dated August 9, 2004 Reply to Office communication of July 8, 2004

7

Basis for restriction practice is illustrated in 35 U.S.C. §121, "[i]f two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application, the Director [of the Patent and Trademark Office] may require the application to be restricted to one of the inventions." The meaning of "independent" and "distinct" is further provided by MPEP §802.01: the term "independent" means that there is no disclosed relationship between the two or more subjects disclosed; the term "distinct" means that two or more subjects as disclosed are related, for example, as combination and part thereof, process, and apparatus for its practice, process and product made, etc., but are capable of separate manufacture, use, or sale as claimed.

The present application relates to the discovery of a minimal catalytic structure to support the enzymatic activity of a vanadium haloperoxidase. This discovery allows the recombinant production of minimal catalytic vanadium haloperoxidases and use of such recombinant polypeptides in enzymatic halogenation of compounds. The subject matter of the restriction requirement, particularly that of Groups II and III, are closely related as the claimed method of enzymatic halogenation of Group III requires the use of the recombinant minimal catalytic vanadium haloperoxidase of Group II. Thus, the subjects upon which the restriction requirement is imposed are not "independent" under 35 U.S.C. §121 according to the MPEP's definition.

Nor are the subjects "distinct" under 35 U.S.C. §121 according to the MPEP's definition. Because the claimed enzymatic halogenation method of Group III relies on the recombinant polypeptides of Group II, they cannot be separated from each other when the claimed method is practiced.

Because of the common inventive concept and the close relation between the subject matter of Groups II and III, the examination of these two Groups together would not impose any additional, unreasonable burden on the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction requirement is improper and request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the requirement.

Appl. No. 10/691,383 Resp. dated August 9, 2004 Reply to Office communication of July 8, 2004

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

Chuan Gao

Reg. No. 54,111

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP

Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3834

Tel: 415-576-0200 Fax: 415-576-0300

CG:cg 60279949 v1